

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-13 have been amended, and Claims 14-17 have been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claims 4-13 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 (c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

Applicants have amended Claims 4-13 to address this objection by removing the multiple dependencies. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this objection and substantively examine Claims 4-13.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that it is unclear what is encompassed by the phrase “bay-like bulge.”

Applicants respectfully assert that “bay-like bulge” is clearly illustrated in the Figures and described in the specification. More specifically, a plurality of bay-like bulges are illustrated and identified by numerals 11, 12, 16, 17, and 18. The phrase “bay-like” generally refers to the shape of the bulge and is similar to the shape of a bay window of a house. Accordingly, because the phrase “bay-like bulge” is clearly illustrated and described in the specification, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,199,285 (“Bader”).

Bader does not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended independent Claim 1. More specifically, Bader does not teach or suggest a drive unit including at least one bay-like bulge which extends over a circumferential section of the drive wheel near the drive wheel, and wherein the bay-like bulge is provided at a side of the drive housing and is a projection projecting from said side. Rather, Bader discloses a machining unit suitable for transfer machines. The machining unit includes a transmission 17 arranged inside of a transmission housing 18.


The Examiner has identified on Figure 2 of Bader what he considers to be the bay-like bulge on the transmission housing 18. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the areas identified by the Examiner on Figure 2 of Bader as a bay-like bulge are just an edge or corner of the transmission housing 18. The identified areas on Figure 2 of Bader do not protrude or project from the general shape of the transmission housing 18. The entire transmission housing 18 is of the general shape illustrated in Figure 2 of Bader and no protrusions or projections extend outwardly from that general shape.

For at least these reasons, Bader does not teach or suggest the subject matter of Claim 1. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-17 depend from Claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, allowance of Claims 1-17 is respectfully requested. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,



Julie A. Haut
Reg. No. 51,789

Docket No. 041165-9059-00

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560

T:\CLIENTA\041165\9059\A1922465.1